

E

675

895




Rep 15. 16

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Chapman
Shelf

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
PRINTED AT THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES





Interest and Duty of Colored Citizens in the
Presidential Election.

LETTER

TO


COLORED CITIZENS

BY

HON. CHARLES SUMNER,

JULY 29, 1872.

"I will say to the North, Give up; and to the South, Keep not back."—*Isaiah*, chap. xliii, v. 6.



WASHINGTON:
F. & J. RIVES & GEO. A. BAILEY,
REPORTERS AND PRINTERS OF THE DEBATES OF CONGRESS.
1872.

Letter to Colored Citizens.

WASHINGTON, D. C., July 11, 1872.

SIR: We, the undersigned, citizens of color, regarding you as the purest and best friend of our race, admiring your consistent course in the United States Senate and elsewhere as the special advocate of our rights, and believing that your counsel at this critical juncture in the period of our citizenship would be free from personal feeling and partisan prejudice, have ventured to request your opinion as to what action the colored voters of the nation should take in the presidential contest now pending.

The choice of our people is now narrowed down to General Grant or Horace Greeley. Your long acquaintance with both and your observation have enabled you to arrive at a correct conclusion as to which of the candidates, judging from their antecedents as well as their present position, will, if elected, enforce the requirements of the Constitution and the laws respecting our civil and political rights with the most heartfelt sympathy and the greatest vigor.

We hope and trust you will favor us with such reply as will serve to enlighten our minds upon this subject and impel our people to go forward in the right direction. Our confidence in your judgment is so firm that, in our opinion, thousands of the intelligent colored voters of the country will be guided in their action by your statement and advice.

Hoping to receive a reply soon, we have the honor to be, with great respect, your obedient servants,

A. T. AUGUSTA, M. D.,
DAVID FISHER, sr.,
JNO. H. SMITH,
EDWARD CRUSER,
WM. H. A. WORMLEY,
WILLIAM P. WILSON,
R. W. TOMPKINS,
JOHN H. BROWN,
HENRY LACY,
W. H. BELL,
J. L. N. BOWEN, M. D.,
JACOB DE WITTER,
SAMUEL PROCTER,
J. J. KETCHUM,
CHAS. N. THOMAS,
WM. H. SHORTER,
HENRY HILL,
TURMAN J. SHADD,
GEO. D. JOHNSON,
CHRIS. A. FLEETWOOD,
CHAS. F. BRUCE,
DAVID FISHER, jr.,
DAVID KING,
WM. POLKENY.

Hon. CHARLES SUMNER.

WASHINGTON, July 29, 1872.

GENTLEMEN AND FELLOW-CITIZENS:

If I have delayed answering your communication of July 11, which was duly placed in

my hands by your committee, it is not because the proper course for you seemed doubtful, but because I wished to reflect upon it and be aided by information which time might supply. Since then I have carefully considered the inquiries addressed me and have listened to much on both sides, but my best judgment now is in harmony with my early conclusion.

I am touched by the appeal you make. It is true that I am the friend of your race, and I am glad to be assured that in your opinion I have held a consistent course in the Senate and elsewhere as the special advocate of your rights. That course, by the blessing of God, I mean to hold so long as life lasts. I know your infinite wrongs, and feel for them as my own. You only do me simple justice when you add a belief that my counsel at this critical juncture of your citizenship would be free from personal feelings and partisan prejudice. In answering your inquiries I can have no sentiment except for your good, which I most anxiously seek; nor can any disturbing influence be allowed to interfere. The occasion is too solemn. Especially is there no room for personal feeling or for partisan prejudice. No man or party can expect power except for the general welfare. Therefore they must be brought to the standard of truth, which is without feeling or prejudice.

QUESTIONS PROPOSED.

You are right in saying that the choice for the Presidency is now "narrowed down" to President Grant or Horace Greeley. One of these is to be taken, and, assuming my acquaintance with both and my observation of their lives, you invite my judgment between them, asking me especially which of the two, *judging from their antecedents as well as present position*, would enforce the Constitution and laws securing your civil and political rights with *the most heartfelt sympathy and the greatest vigor*. Here I remark that, in this inquiry, you naturally put your rights in the foreground. So do I;—believing most sincerely that the best interests of the whole country are associated with the completest recognition of your rights, so that the two races shall live together in unbroken harmony. I also remark that you call attention to two things, the "antecedents" of the candidates, and secondly their "present position." You wish to know from these which gives assurance of the most heartfelt sympathy and greatest vigor in the maintenance of your rights; in other words, which, judging by the past, will be your truest friend.

The communication with which you have honored me is not alone. Colored fellow-citizens in other parts of the country, I may say in nearly every State of the Union, have made a similar request, and some complain that I have thus far kept silent. I am not insensible to the trust reposed in me. But if my opinion is given, it must be candidly

according to my conscience. In this spirit I answer your inquiries, beginning with the antecedents of the two candidates.

ANTECEDENTS OF THE CANDIDATES.

I. Horace Greeley was born to poverty and educated himself in a printing office. President Grant, fortunate in early patronage, became a cadet at West Point and was educated at the public expense. One started with nothing but industry and character; the other started with a military commission. One was trained as a civilian; the other as a soldier. Horace Greeley stood forth as a Reformer and Abolitionist. President Grant enlisted as a pro-slavery Democrat, and, at the election of James Buchanan, fortified by his vote all the pretensions of slavery, including the Dred Scott decision. Horace Greeley from early life was earnest and constant against slavery, full of sympathy with the colored race, and always foremost in the great battle for their rights. President Grant, except as a soldier, summoned by the terrible accident of war, never did anything against slavery, nor has he at any time shown any sympathy with the colored race, but rather indifference if not aversion. Horace Greeley earnestly desired that colored citizens should vote, and ably championed impartial suffrage; but President Grant was on the other side.

Beyond these contrasts, which are marked, it cannot be forgotten that Horace Greeley is a person of large heart and large understanding, trained to the support of Human Rights, always beneficent with the poor, always ready for any good cause, and never deterred by opposition or reproach, as when for long years he befriended your people. Add to these qualities, conspicuous in his life, untiring industry, which leaves no moment without its fruit—abundant political knowledge—acquaintance with history—the instinct and grasp of statesmanship—an amiable nature—a magnanimous soul, and above all an honesty which no suspicion has touched, and you have a brief portrait where are antecedents of Horace Greeley.

Few of these things appear in the President. His great success in war, and the honors he has won, cannot change the record of his conduct toward your people, especially in contrast with the life-time fidelity of his competitor, while there are unhappy "antecedents" showing that in the prosecution of his plans he cares nothing for the colored race. The story is painful; but it must be told.

GRANT'S INDIGNITY TO THE COLORED RACE.

I refer to the outrage he perpetrated upon Hayti with its eight hundred thousand blacks, engaged in the great experiment of self-government. Here is a most instructive "antecedent," revealing beyond question his true nature, and the whole is attested by documentary evidence. Conceiving the idea of annexing Dominica, which is the Spanish part of the island, and shrinking at nothing, he began by seizing the war powers of the Government, in flagrant violation of the Constitution, and then,

at great expenditure of money, sent several armed ships of the Navy, including monitors, to maintain the usurper Baez in power, that through him he might obtain the coveted prize. Not content with this audacious dictatorship, he proceeded to strike at the independence of the Black Republic by open menace of war, and all without the sanction of Congress, to which is committed the power to make war. Sailing into the harbor of Port au Prince with our most powerful monitor, the Dictator, properly named for this service, also the frigate Severn as consort and other monitors in their train, the Admiral, acting under instructions from Washington, proceeded to the Executive Mansion, accompanied by officers of his squadron, and then, pointing to the great war ships in sight from the windows, dealt his unjust menace, threatening to sink or capture Haytian ships. The President was black, not white. The Admiral would have done no such thing to any white ruler, nor would our country have tolerated such menace from any Government in the world. Here was indignity not only to the Black Republic, with its population of eight hundred thousand, but to the African race everywhere, and especially in our own country. Nor did it end here. For months the Navy of the United States was kept hovering on the coast, holding that insulted people in constant dread and anxiety, while President Grant was to them like a hawk sailing in the air ready to swoop upon his prey.

FALSE IMPRISONMENT OF AN AMERICAN CITIZEN.

This heartless, cruel proceeding found a victim among our white fellow-citizens. An excellent merchant of Connecticut, praised by all who know him, was plunged into prison by Baez, where he was immured because it was feared that on his return to New York he would expose the frauds of the plotters, and this captivity was prolonged with the connivance of two agents of the President, one of whom finds constant favor with him and is part of the military ring immediately about him. That such an outrage could go unpunished shows the little regard of the President for human rights, whether in white or black.

HARD TO BEAR THESE OUTRAGES.

I confess my trials, as I was called to witness these things. Always a supporter of the Administration, and sincerely desiring to labor with it, I had never uttered a word with regard to it except in kindness. My early opposition to the Treaty of Annexation was reserved, so that for some time my opinions were unknown. It was only when I saw the breach of all law, human and divine, that I was aroused, and then began the anger of the President and of his rings, military and senatorial. Devoted to the African race, I felt for them, besides being humbled that the Great Republic, acting through its President, could set such an example, where the national Constitution, International Law, and Humanity were all sacrificed. Especially was I moved when I saw the indignity

to the colored race which was accomplished by trampling upon a fundamental principle of International Law, declaring the equality of nations, as our Declaration of Independence declares the equality of men.

This terrible transaction, which nobody can defend, is among the "antecedents" of President Grant, from which you can judge how much the colored race can rely upon his "heart-felt sympathies." Nor can it be forgotten that shortly afterward, on the return of the Commission from this island, Hon. Frederick Douglass, the colored orator, accomplished in manners as in eloquence, was thrust away from the company of the commissioners at the common table of the mail packet on the Potomac, almost within sight of the Executive Mansion, simply on account of his color; but the President, at whose invitation he had joined the Commission, never uttered a word in condemnation of this exclusion, and when entertaining the returned commissioners at dinner carefully omitted Mr. Douglass, who was in Washington at the time, and thus repeated the indignity.

OTHER ANTECEDENTS.

Other things might be mentioned, showing the sympathies of the President; but I cannot forget the Civil Rights Bill, which is the cap-stone of that Equality before the Law to which all are entitled without distinction of color. President Grant, who could lobby so assiduously for his St. Domingo scheme, full of wrong to the colored race, could do nothing for this beneficent measure. During a long session of Congress it was discussed constantly, and the colored people everywhere hung upon the debate; but there was no word of "heart-felt sympathy" from the President. At last, just before the nominating convention, he addressed a letter to a meeting of colored fellow-citizens in Washington, called to advance this cause, where he avoided the question by declaring himself in favor of "the exercise of those rights to which every citizen should be justly entitled," leaving it uncertain whether colored people are justly entitled to the rights secured by the pending bill. I understand that Horace Greeley has been already assailed by an impracticable Democrat as friendly to this bill; but nobody has lipped against President Grant on this account.

Among "antecedents," I deem it my duty to mention the little capacity or industry of the President in protecting colored people and in assuring peace at the South. Nobody can doubt that a small portion of the effort and earnest will, even without the lobbying so freely given to the St. Domingo scheme, would have averted those Ku Klux outrages which we deplore, thus superseding all pretense for further legislation by Congress. But he is disabled both by character and the drawback of his own conduct. After violating the Constitution and International Law to insult the Black Republic, and setting an example of insubordination, he is not in condition to rebuke law-breakers.

PRESENT POSITION OF CANDIDATES.

II. Passing from "antecedents," I come now to the "present position" of the two candidates, which is the subject of your next inquiry. If in any formal particulars the two are on equality, yet in all substantial respects the obvious advantage is with Horace Greeley.

NOMINATIONS OF THE TWO CANDIDATES.

Each was nominated by a Republican convention, one at Cincinnati and the other at Philadelphia, so that in this respect they may seem to be on equality. But it will not fail to be observed that the convention at Cincinnati was composed of able and acknowledged Republicans, many having acted with the party from its first formation, who, without previous organization, came together voluntarily for the sake of Reform and Parity in the Government; while, on the other hand, the convention at Philadelphia was composed of delegates chosen largely under the influence of officeholders who assembled to sustain what is known as Grantism, being the personal government and personal pretensions of President Grant, involving nepotism, repayment of gifts by official patronage, neglect of public duty, absenteeism, quarreling, military rule, disregard of Constitution and law, with general unfitness and indignity to the colored race—all of which is so un-republican as to make its support impossible for true Republicans. Therefore, the convention at Philadelphia, though calling itself Republican, was less Republican in reality than that at Cincinnati.

THE TWO PLATFORMS.

The two platforms, so far as concerns especially the colored race, are alike in substance, but that of Cincinnati is expressed in terms most worthy of the equal rights it states and claims: "We recognize the equality of all men before the law and hold that it is the duty of Government in its dealings with the people to mete out equal and exact justice to all of whatever nativity, race, color or persuasion, religious or political." In other respects the platform of Cincinnati is the most republican, inasmuch as it sets itself against those un-republican abuses which have been nursed by the President into pernicious activity.

SUPPORTERS OF THE TWO CANDIDATES.

From the two nominations and two platforms I come to the supporters of the candidates; and here I look, first, at those immediately about them, and, secondly, at the popular support behind.

Horace Greeley has among his immediate supporters, in all parts of the country, devoted and consistent Republicans, always earnest for Reform and Parity in government on whose lives there is no shadow of suspicion—being a contrast in character to those rings which play such a part in the present Administration. The country knows too well the military Ring, the Senatorial Ring, and the Custom-House Ring, through which the President

acts. Such supporters are a poor recommendation.

DEMOCRATS TURNING REPUBLICANS.

Looking at the popular support behind, the advantage is still with Horace Greeley. President Grant has at his back the diversified army of officeholders, drilled to obey the word of command. The speeches praising him are by officeholders and members of rings. Horace Greeley finds flocking to his cause large numbers of Republicans unwilling to continue the existing misrule, and as allies with them a regenerated party springing forward to unite in this liberal movement. Democrats in joining Horace Greeley have changed simply as President Grant changed when he joined the Republicans, except that he was rewarded at once with high office. The change is open. Adopting the Republican platform which places the Equal Rights of All under the safeguard of irreversible guarantees and at the same time accepting the nomination of a lifetime Abolitionist, who represents preëminently the sentiment of duty to the colored race, they have set their corporate seal to the sacred covenant. They may continue Democrats in name, but they are in reality Republicans, by the same title that those who sustain Republican principles are Republicans, or rather they are Democrats, according to the original signification of that word, dedicated to the rights of the people.

It is idle to say that Horace Greeley and the Republicans that nominated him are any less Republican because Democrats unite with them in support of cherished principles and the candidate who represents them. Conversions are always welcome, and not less so, because the change is in a multitude rather than an individual. A political party cannot, if it would, and should not if it could, shut the door against converts, whether counted by the score, the hundred, or the thousand; and so we find that the supporters of President Grant announce with partisan triumph the adhesion of a single Democratic politician or a single Democratic newspaper. On equal reason and with higher pride may the supporters of Horace Greeley announce the adhesion of the Democratic party, which, turning from the things that are behind, presses on to those that are before.

GREELEY'S ELECTION THE TRIUMPH OF REPUBLICAN PRINCIPLES.

It is also idle to say that the election of Horace Greeley as President with Gratz Brown as Vice President, both unchangeable Republicans, will be the return of the Democratic party to power. On the contrary it will be the inauguration of Republican principles, under the safeguard of a Republican President and Republican Vice President, with Democrats as avowed supporters. In the organization of his Administration and in the conduct of affairs Horace Greeley will naturally lean upon those who represent best the great promises of Equal Rights and Reconciliation made at Cincinnati. If Democrats are taken, it will be as Republicans in heart,

recognizing the associate terms of the settlement as an immutable finality.

The hardihood of political falsehood reaches its extreme point when it is asserted that under Horace Greeley the freedmen will be reënslaved, or that colored people will in any way suffer in their equal rights. On the contrary they have in his election not only the promises of the platform, but also the splendid example for a full generation, during which he has never wavered in the assertion of their rights. To suppose that Horace Greeley, when placed where he can do them the most good, will depart from the rule of his honest life is an insult to reason.

It is none the less idle to suppose that Democrats supporting Horace Greeley expect or desire that he should depart from those principles which are the glory of his character. They have accepted the Cincinnati platform with its two-fold promises and intend in good faith to maintain it. Democrats cannot turn back, who at the convention adopting this platform, sang Greeley songs to the tune of "Old John Brown, his soul is marching on." Seeking especially the establishment of character in the National Government, they will expect their President to be always true to himself.

Therefore I put aside the partisan allegations, that Horace Greeley has gone to the Democrats, or that he will be controlled by Democrats. Each is without foundation or reason, according to my judgment. They are attempts to avoid what you recognize as the true issue, being the question between the two candidates, or, perhaps, they may be considered as scarecrows, to deter the timid. Nobody who votes for Horace Greeley will go to the Democrats, nor do I believe that when elected Horace Greeley will be under any influence except that enlightened conscience which will keep him ever true to the principles he represents.

The conclusion from this comparison between the two candidates is plain. Unquestionably the surest trust of the colored people is in Horace Greeley. In everything for your protection and advancement he will show always the most heart-felt sympathy and the greatest vigor beyond what can be expected from President Grant. He is your truest friend.

VOTE FOR GREELEY.

Gentlemen, in thus answering your two inquiries, I have shown why you, as colored fellow citizens, and also all who would uphold your rights and save the colored race from indignity, should refuse to sanction the reëlection of the President, and put your trust in Horace Greeley. I ought to add that with him will be associated as Vice President Gratz Brown, whom I have known for years as a most determined Abolitionist. The two together will carry into the National Government an unswerving devotion to your rights, not to be disturbed by partisan dictation or sectional prejudice.

Besides all this, which may fitly guide you in determining between the two candidates,

it is my duty to remind you, that, as citizens of the United States, and part of the country, your welfare is indissolubly associated with that of the whole country. Where all are prosperous you will be gainers. Therefore, while justly careful of your own rights, you cannot be indifferent to the blessings of good government. It is for you to consider, whether the time has not come for something better than the sword, and whether a character like Horace Greeley does not give stronger assurance of good government than can be found in the insulter of the colored race, already famous for the rings about him and his plain inaptitude for civil life. The supporters of President Grant compel us to observe his offenses and short-comings. The painful contrast with Horace Greeley becomes manifest. It will be for others in the present canvass to hold it before the American people.

TOO MUCH OF A REPUBLICAN TO VOTE FOR GRANT.

Speaking now for myself I have to say, that my vote will be given for Horace Greeley; but, in giving it, I do not go to the Democratic party, nor am I any less a Republican. On the contrary I am so much of a Republican that I cannot support a candidate whose conduct in civil life shows an incapacity to appreciate Republican principles, and whose Administration is marked by acts of delinquency, especially toward the colored race, by the side of which the allegations on the impeachment of Andrew Johnson were technical and trivial. Unquestionably President Grant deserved impeachment for high crimes and misdemeanors, rather than a renomination, and, on the trial, it would have been enough to exhibit his seizure of the war powers and his indignity to the Black Republic with its population of 800,000, in violation of the national Constitution and of International Law. And here a contrast arises between him and Abraham Lincoln. The latter in his first annual message recommended the recognition of what he called the "independence and sovereignty of Hayti;" but it is at these that President Grant has struck. One of Abraham Lincoln's earliest acts was to put the Black Republic on equality with other Powers; one of President Grant's earliest acts was to degrade it.

I am so much of a Republican, that I wish to see in the Presidential chair a life-time Abolitionist. I also wish a President sincerely devoted to Civil Service Reform beginning with the "One-Term Principle," which President Grant once accepted but now disowns. I also wish a President who sets the example of industry and unselfish dedication to the public good. And I wish to see a President through whom we may expect peace and harmony instead of discord. Strangely President Grant seems to delight in strife. If he finds no enemy, he falls upon his friends, as when he struck at the Black Republic, insulted Russia in his Annual Message, offended both France and Germany, and, then in personal relations, quarreled generally.

PRINCIPLES ABOVE PARTY.

My own personal experience teaches how futile is the charge that because Horace Greeley receives Democratic votes, therefore he becomes a Democrat, or lapses under Democratic control. I was first chosen to the Senate by a coalition of Free Soilers and Democrats. Democratic votes helped make me Senator from Massachusetts, as they also helped make my excellent friend, Mr. Chase, Senator from Ohio, and will help make Horace Greeley President. But neither Mr. Chase or myself was on this account less faithful as Free Soiler, and, answering for myself, I know that I never became a Democrat or lapsed under Democratic control. I do not doubt that Horace Greeley will be equally consistent. The charge to the contrary, so vehemently repeated, seems to reflect the character of those who make it, except that many repeat it by rote.

There is a common saying, "Principles, not men," and on this ground an appeal is made for President Grant, feeling justly that, in any personal comparison with Horace Greeley, he must fail. But a better saying is "Principles and Men." I am for the principles of the Republican Party in contradiction to Grantism, and I am for the man who truly represents them. By these principles I shall stand, for them I shall labor, and in their triumph I shall always rejoice. If any valued friend separates from me now, it will be because he *places a man above principles*. Early in public life I declared my little heed for party, and my indifference to the name by which I am called; and now I confess my want of sympathy with those who would cling to the form after its spirit has fled.

GREELEY'S NOMINATION A RESPONSE TO LONGING FOR PEACE.

This answer would be incomplete if I did not call attention to another and controlling consideration, which cannot be neglected by the good citizen. Watching the remarkable movement, that has ended in the double nomination of Horace Greeley, it is easy to see that it did not proceed from politicians, whether at Cincinnati or Baltimore. Evidently it was the heart of the people, sorely wrung by war and the controversies it engendered, which found this expression. Sir Philip Sidney said of the uprising in the Netherlands, "It is the spirit of the Lord and is irresistible," and such a spirit is manifest now. I would not use the word lightly, but to my mind it is providential. Notwithstanding the counteracting influence of politicians, Republican and Democratic—in the face of persistent ridicule—and against the extravagance of unscrupulous opposition, the nomination at Cincinnati was triumphantly adopted at Baltimore. Such an unprecedented victory without concert or propulsion of any kind can be explained only by supposing that it is in harmony with a popular longing. That Democrats, and especially those of the South, should adopt a life-time Abolitionist for President is an assurance of willingness to asso-

ciate the rights of their colored fellow-citizens with that reconciliation of which Horace Greeley was an early representative. In standing by Jefferson Davis at his trial and signing his bail-bond, he showed the same sentiment of humanity he so constantly displayed in standing by the colored race throughout their prolonged trial, so that the two discordant races find kindred hospitality in him, and he thus becomes a tie of union. In harmony with this interesting circumstance is the assurance in his letter of acceptance, that if elected he will be "the President, not of a party, but of the whole people."

RECONCILIATION.

The nomination has been adopted by the Democrats in convention assembled. This was an event which the supporters of President Grant declared impossible. I do not see how it can be regarded otherwise than as a peace-offering. As such it is of infinite value. The Past is rejected and a new Future is begun with the promise of concord. Here is no ordinary incident. It is a Revolution, and its success in pacifying the country will be in proportion to its acceptance by us. I dare not neglect the great opportunity, nor can I stand aloof. It is in harmony with my life which places Peace above all things except the Rights of Man. Thus far, in constant efforts for the colored race, I have sincerely sought the good of all, which I was sure would be best obtained in fulfilling the promises of the Declaration of Independence, making all equal in rights. The spirit in which I acted appears in an early speech where I said: "Nothing in hate; nothing in vengeance." My object was security for Human Rights. Most anxiously I have looked for the time, which seems now at hand, when there should be reconciliation, not only between the North and South, but between the two races, so that the two sections and the two races may be lifted from the ruts and grooves in which they are now fastened, and instead of *irritating antagonism* without end, there shall be *sympathetic cooperation*.

The existing differences ought to be ended. There is a time for all things, and we are admonished by a wide-spread popular uprising, bursting the bonds of party, that the time has come for estrangement to cease between people, who, by the ordinance of God, must live together. Gladly do I welcome the happy signs; nor can I observe without regret the the colored people in organized masses resisting the friendly overtures, even to the extent of intimidating those who are the other way. It is for them to consider carefully whether they should not take advantage of the unexpected opening and recognize the "bail bond" given at Baltimore as the assurance of peace, and unite with me in holding the parties to the full performance of its conditions. Provided always that their rights are fixed, I am sure it cannot be best for the colored people to band together in a hostile camp, provoking antagonism and keeping alive the separation of races. Above all there must be no intimidation, but

every voter must act freely without constraint from league or lodge. Much better will it be when the two political parties compete for your votes, each anxious for your support. Only then will that citizenship, by which you are entitled to the equal rights of all, have its natural fruits. Only then will there be that harmony which is essential to a true civilization.

The present position of the colored citizen is perilous. He is exposed to injurious pressure where he needs support; but I see no early extrication except in the way now proposed. Let him cut adrift from managers who would wield him merely as a political force, with little regard to his own good, and bravely stand by the candidate who has stood by him. If Democrats unite with him, so much the better. The association once begun must naturally ripen in common friendship and trust.

I am for peace in reality as in name. From the bottom of my heart I am for peace, and I welcome all that makes for peace. With deep-felt satisfaction I remember that no citizen who drew his sword against us has suffered by the hand of the executioner. In just association with this humanity will be the triumph of Equal Rights when the promises of the great Declaration are all fulfilled, and our people are united, as never before, in the enduring fellowship of a common citizenship. To this end there must be reconciliation, nor can I withhold my hand. Freely I accept the hand that is offered, and reach forth my own in friendly grasp. I am against the policy of hate; I am against fanning ancient flames into continued life; I am against raking the ashes of the Past for coals of fire yet burning. Pile up the ashes; extinguish the flames; abolish the hate. And now, turning to the Democratic party, I hold it to all the covenants solemnly given in the adoption of a Republican Platform with Horace Greeley as candidate. There can be no backward step.

WATCHWORD FOR THE CANVASS.

With no common sympathy I observe that Mr. Hendricks, a leading Democrat, whom I knew and esteemed in the Senate, has recently announced his acceptance of the Constitutional Amendments with their logical results. He proposes, as a proper keynote to the popular movement now swelling to a sure triumph: "Just Laws and Public Virtue." This is a worthy aspiration, entirely fit for the occasion. My watch-word is, "The Unity of the Republic, and the Equal Rights of All, with Reconciliation." Such is my heartfelt cry, and wherever my voice can reach, there do I insist upon all these, humbly invoking the blessings of Divine Providence, which, I believe, must descend upon such a cause.


Accept my best wishes for yourselves personally and for the people you represent, and believe me, gentlemen, your faithful friend,

CHARLES SUMNER.

To Dr. AUGUSTA, WILLIAM H. A. WORMLEY, and others.



LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 013 789 090 2